

REMARKS

I. Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawing as informal. The Applicant has included a Replacement Drawing Sheet for Figure 1.

II. Claim Objections

The Examiner rejected claim 1 because of the following informalities: (1) claim 1 is an improper Jepson claim; (2) as to the phrase “a number of images,” it is unclear as to how many images; and (3) there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the calculated radiation transport model parameters” in line 13.

The Applicant has amended claim 1 to remove the phrase “improved,” and to change “a number of images” to “a plurality of images.” The Applicant appreciates the Examiner’s helpful suggestions. The Applicant has also amended claim 1 to clarify step (e): “using the calculated model parameter values to determine the surface reflectance for the selected image pixels for each of the specific wavelength bands for each combination of trial visibility value and trial aerosol property value or values, or aerosol type.” The “model parameter values” are calculated in step (c) of claim 1.

III. Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, because “the claim includes the amended limitation in which trial visibility values are provided for a plurality of trail aerosol values and/or a plurality of aerosol types. Providing the visibility for a plurality of aerosol values and a plurality of aerosol types is not described in the original disclosure.”

The Applicant has amended claim 36 to delete the limitation “and/or a plurality of aerosol types.” The Applicant has added claim 37, which includes the following limitation,” in which trial aerosol visibility values are provided for a plurality of aerosol types.” No new matter has been added.

IV. Conclusion

The Applicant has addressed each of the Examiner’s objections and rejections, and respectfully contends that claims 1-7, and 36-37 are patentable. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance.

If for any reason this Response is found to be incomplete, or if at any time it appears that a telephone conference with counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned in Westborough, Massachusetts, (508) 898-1501. If any payment during prosecution is found to be insufficient or if any overpayment is found, please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to my deposit account number 50-1582.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian M. Dingman
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 32,729
Customer No. 25834
Tel: (508) 898-1501
Fax: (508) 898-1502

MIRICK, O’CONNELL, DEMALLIE & LOUGEE, LLP
1700 West Park Drive, Westborough, MA 01581